

STRICT MODEL STRUCTURES FOR PRO-CATEGORIES

DANIEL C. ISAKSEN

ABSTRACT. We show that if $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper model category, then the pro-category $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ has a strict model structure in which the weak equivalences are the levelwise weak equivalences. This is related to a major result of [10]. The strict model structure is the starting point for many homotopy theories of pro-objects such as those described in [5], [17], and [19].

1. INTRODUCTION

If $\mathcal{C}$ is a category, then the category $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ has as objects all cofiltered diagrams in $\mathcal{C}$ and has morphisms defined by

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) = \lim_t \text{colim}_s \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_s, Y_t).$$

Pro-categories have found many uses over the years in fields such as algebraic geometry [2], shape theory [20], geometric topology [6], and possibly even applied mathematics [7, Appendix].

When working with pro-categories, one would frequently like to have a homotopy theory of pro-objects. The first attempts at this appear in [2] and [24] in which pro-objects in homotopy categories are considered. The difficulty with this approach is that the diagrams commute only up to homotopy, and this makes it virtually impossible to make sense of most of the standard notions of homotopy theory in this context.

Much better is to first consider actually commuting cofiltered diagrams (of spaces or simplicial sets or spectra or whatever) and then to define a notion of weak equivalence between such pro-objects. This approach was first taken by [12] in a restricted context.

It was also applied much more generally in [10]. The idea is to start with a model structure (*i.e.*, a homotopy theory) on a category $\mathcal{C}$ and then to construct a *strict model structure* on $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ in which the weak equivalences are more or less just the levelwise weak equivalences. The resulting homotopy theory is precisely suited to study homotopy limits [4, Ch. XI] of cofiltered diagrams. The strict model structure is a starting point for several other model structures such as those described in [5], [17], and [19].

The strict model structure on $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ does not seem to exist for a completely arbitrary model category $\mathcal{C}$. A niceness hypothesis was required in [10, p. 45] (which was weakened in [13]). Unfortunately, many important examples of model categories, such as the usual models for spectra, do not satisfy this hypothesis. The main purpose of this paper is to prove that the strict structure on $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ exists whenever $\mathcal{C}$

Date: August 24, 2001.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 18G55, 55U35.

Key words and phrases. Closed model structures, pro-homotopy theory, pro-spaces.

is a proper model category. Almost all of the most important examples of model categories are proper.

Another problem with [10] is that a non-standard set of axioms for model structures are used. From a modern perspective, it is harder to comprehend the technical details of [10] than to simply work out new proofs from scratch. The secondary goal of this paper is to give these new more modern proofs. Oddly, the two-out-of-three axiom is the most difficult part of the proof; in most model structures, it is automatic from the definition of weak equivalence.

The last goal of the paper is to consider whether strict model structures on pro-categories are fibrantly generated. It is already known that these model structures are not cofibrantly generated in general, even when $\mathcal{C}$ is [17, §19]. We produce reasonable collections of generating fibrations and generating acyclic fibrations that have cosmall codomains, but these collections are not sets. In fact, the strict model structure for pro-simplicial sets is not fibrantly generated. We show that if this strict structure were fibrantly generated, then in the category of simplicial sets there would exist a set of fibrations that detect acyclic cofibrations.

The paper is organized as follows. First we introduce the language of pro-categories and give some background results. Then we define the strict weak equivalences and prove that they satisfy the two-out-of-three axiom when $\mathcal{C}$ is proper. Next we prove that the strict model structure exists when $\mathcal{C}$ is proper. Finally, we consider whether the strict model structure is fibrantly generated.

We assume familiarity with model categories. The original reference is [23], but we follow the notation and terminology of [14] as closely as possible. Other references include [9] and [15].

2. PRELIMINARIES ON PRO-CATEGORIES

We begin with a review of the necessary background on pro-categories. This material can be found in [1], [2], [8], [10], and [18].

2.1. Pro-Categories.

Definition 2.1. For a category $\mathcal{C}$, the category **pro- $\mathcal{C}$** has objects all cofiltering diagrams in $\mathcal{C}$, and

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{pro-}\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) = \lim_s \mathrm{colim}_t \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_t, Y_s).$$

Composition is defined in the natural way.

A category I is **cofiltering** if the following conditions hold: it is non-empty and small; for every pair of objects s and t in I , there exists an object u together with maps $u \rightarrow s$ and $u \rightarrow t$; and for every pair of morphisms f and g with the same source and target, there exists a morphism h such that fh equals gh . Recall that a category is **small** if it has only a set of objects and a set of morphisms. A diagram is said to be **cofiltering** if its indexing category is so. Beware that some material on pro-categories, such as [2] and [21], consider cofiltering categories that are not small. All of our pro-objects will be indexed by small categories.

Objects of **pro- $\mathcal{C}$** are functors from cofiltering categories to $\mathcal{C}$. We use both set theoretic and categorical language to discuss indexing categories; hence “ $t \geq s$ ” and “ $t \rightarrow s$ ” mean the same thing when the indexing category is actually a directed set.

The word *pro-object* refers to objects of pro-categories. A **constant** pro-object is one indexed by the category with one object and one (identity) map. Let $c :$

$\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ be the functor taking an object X to the constant pro-object with value X . Note that this functor makes $\mathcal{C}$ a full subcategory of $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$. The limit functor $\lim : \text{pro-}\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is the right adjoint of c . To avoid confusion, we write $\lim^{\text{pro}}$ for limits computed within the category $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$.

Let $Y : I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $X : J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be arbitrary pro-objects. We say that X is **cofinal** in Y if there is a cofinal functor $F : J \rightarrow I$ such that X is equal to the composite YF . This means that for every s in I , the overcategory $F \downarrow s$ is cofiltered. In the case when F is an inclusion of directed sets, F is cofinal if and only if for every s in I there exists t in J such that $t \geq s$. The importance of this definition is that X is isomorphic to Y in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$.

A **level representation** of a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is: a cofiltered index category I ; pro-objects $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{Y}$ indexed by I and pro-isomorphisms $X \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ and $Y \rightarrow \tilde{Y}$; and a collection of maps $f_s : \tilde{X}_s \rightarrow \tilde{Y}_s$ for all s in I such that for all $t \rightarrow s$ in I , there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{X}_t & \longrightarrow & \tilde{Y}_t \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \tilde{X}_s & \longrightarrow & \tilde{Y}_s \end{array}$$

and such that the maps f_s represent a map $\tilde{f} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{Y}$ belonging to a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \tilde{X} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & \tilde{Y} \end{array}$$

in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$. That is, a level representation is just a natural transformation such that the maps f_s represent the element f of

$$\lim_s \text{colim}_t \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_t, Y_s) \cong \lim_s \text{colim}_t \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_s).$$

Every map has a level representation [2, App. 3.2] [21].

More generally, suppose given any diagram $A \rightarrow \text{pro-}\mathcal{C} : a \mapsto X^a$. A **level representation** of X is: a cofiltered index category I ; a functor $\tilde{X} : A \times I \rightarrow \mathcal{C} : (a, s) \mapsto \tilde{X}_s^a$; and pro-isomorphisms $X^a \rightarrow \tilde{X}^a$ such that for every map $\phi : a \rightarrow b$ in A , $\tilde{X}^\phi$ is a level representation for X^ϕ . In other words, $\tilde{X}$ is a uniform level representation for all the maps in the diagram X .

Not every diagram of pro-objects has a level representation. However, finite diagrams without loops do have level representations. This makes computations of limits and colimits of such diagrams in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ relatively straightforward. To compute this limit or colimit, just take the levelwise limit or colimit of the level representation [2, App. 4.2].

A pro-object X satisfies a certain property **levelwise** if each X_s satisfies that property, and X satisfies this property **essentially levelwise** if it is isomorphic to another pro-object satisfying this property levelwise. Similarly, a level representation $X \rightarrow Y$ satisfies a certain property **levelwise** if each $X_s \rightarrow Y_s$ has this property. A map of pro-objects satisfies this property **essentially levelwise** if it has a level representation satisfying this property levelwise. The following surprisingly general

and very useful proposition about retracts of essentially levelwise maps is proved in [18, Thm. 5.5].

Proposition 2.2. *Let C be any class of maps in a category $\mathcal{C}$. Then retracts preserve the class of maps in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ that belong to C essentially levelwise.*

2.2. Cofiniteness. A directed set $(I, \leq)$ is **cofinite** if for every t , the set of elements s of I such that $s \leq t$ is finite. A pro-object or level representation is **cofinite directed** if it is indexed by a cofinite directed set.

For every cofiltered category I , there exists a cofinite directed set J and a cofinal functor $J \rightarrow I$ [10, Th. 2.1.6] (or [1, Exposé 1, 8.1.6]). Therefore, every pro-object is isomorphic to a cofinite directed pro-object. Similarly, every map has a cofinite directed level representation. Thus, it is possible to restrict the definition of a pro-object to only consider cofinite directed sets as index categories, but we find this unnatural for general definitions and constructions. On the other hand, we find it much easier to work with cofinite directed pro-objects in practice. Thus, most of our results start by assuming without loss of generality that a pro-object is indexed by a cofinite directed set. Cofiniteness is critical because many arguments and constructions proceed inductively.

Definition 2.3. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a cofinite directed level representation of a map in a pro-category. For every index t , the **relative matching map** $M_t f$ is the map

$$X_t \rightarrow \lim_{s < t} X_s \times_{\lim_{s < t} Y_s} Y_t.$$

The terminology is motivated by the fact that these maps appear in Reedy model structures [14, Defn. 16.3.2]. The similarity is not coincidental. The strict model structure is closely linked to the Reedy model structures for each fixed cofinite directed index category [10, §3.2].

3. STRICT WEAK EQUIVALENCES

We now study strict weak equivalences for pro-categories as originally described in [10]. The niceness hypothesis of [10, p. 45] is not satisfied by many categories of interest. These include many of the standard models for spectra, such as Bousfield-Friedlander spectra [3], symmetric spectra [16], or S -modules [11]. We shall study strict weak equivalences in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ whenever $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper model category.

Definition 3.1. The **strict weak equivalences** of $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ are the essentially levelwise weak equivalences.

Actually, a more complicated definition appears in [10, § 3.3], but we shall prove in Proposition 3.7 the equivalence of that definition and ours.

It is not obvious from the definition that the strict weak equivalences satisfy the two-out-of-three axiom. The next few lemmas prove this axiom. These proofs are the technical heart of the paper. They are the reason that we must assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is proper. The basic complication is that given a diagram of strict weak equivalences, it is not necessarily possible to find a level representation for the diagram such that the level representations of all maps are levelwise weak equivalences. Independently, each map has a level representation that is a levelwise weak equivalence, but the reindexing for these level representations may be different.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a model category, and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a level representation of an isomorphism in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$. After reindexing along a cofinal functor, f can be*

factored into a levelwise cofibration that is also a pro-isomorphism followed by a levelwise fibration that is also a pro-isomorphism.

Remark 3.3. The model structure on $\mathcal{C}$ is not really necessary. We just need a category $\mathcal{C}$ and two classes of morphisms C and F such that each morphism of $\mathcal{C}$ can be factored (not necessarily functorially) into an element of C followed by an element of F .

Proof. We may assume that f is indexed by a directed set I . Since f is an isomorphism, for every s in I , there exists $t > s$ and a map $h_{ts} : Y_t \rightarrow X_s$ belonging to a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_t & \longrightarrow & Y_t \\ \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow \\ X_s & \longrightarrow & Y_s. \end{array}$$

In effect, the maps h_{ts} represent the inverse of f . By restricting to cofinal subsets, we may assume that such a diagram exists for every $t > s$. We choose a map $h_{ts} : Y_t \rightarrow X_s$ for each pair $t > s$.

Factor each map $f_s : X_s \rightarrow Y_s$ into a cofibration $X_s \rightarrow Z_s$ followed by a fibration $Z_s \rightarrow Y_s$. We shall define structure maps making Z into a pro-object.

Define a category J whose objects are the elements of I and whose morphisms $t \rightarrow s$ are finite chains $t = u_0 > u_1 > \cdots > u_n = s$. Composition is defined by concatenation of chains. Note that J is not a directed set; it is not even cofiltered.

For every morphism $t = u_0 > u_1 > \cdots > u_n = s$ in J , define a map $Z_t \rightarrow Z_s$ by the composition

$$Z_t \longrightarrow Y_t = Y_{u_0} \xrightarrow{h_{u_0 u_1}} X_{u_1} \longrightarrow X_{u_2} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_{u_n} = X_s \longrightarrow Z_s.$$

A diagram chase shows that this makes Z into a diagram indexed by J .

There may be more than one map from a given Z_t to a given Z_s , but another diagram chase shows that they become equal after composition with some map $Z_u \rightarrow Z_t$. Consider the category K defined to be a quotient of J as follows. The objects of K are the same as the objects of J , and two morphisms from t to s in J are identified in K if the corresponding maps from Z_t to Z_s are equal in $\mathcal{C}$. Now K is a cofiltered category, and we may consider it as the indexing category of Z .

The projection functor $K \rightarrow I$ is cofinal, so we may reindex X and Y along this functor. More diagram chases show that the maps $X_s \rightarrow Z_s$ and $Z_s \rightarrow Y_s$ assemble into level representations $X \rightarrow Z$ and $Z \rightarrow Y$. It remains only to show that these maps are pro-isomorphisms. This follows from the commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_t & \longrightarrow & Z_t \\ \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow \\ X_s & \longrightarrow & Z_s \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Z_t & \longrightarrow & Y_t \\ \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow \\ Z_s & \longrightarrow & Y_s \end{array}$$

for every pair $t > s$. The diagonal maps in the above diagrams are the compositions $Z_t \rightarrow Y_t \rightarrow X_s$ and $Y_t \rightarrow X_s \rightarrow Z_s$ respectively. $\square$

Remark 3.4. There is a more obvious argument where a level representation $X \rightarrow Y$ is functorially factored into a levelwise cofibration $X \rightarrow Z$ followed by a levelwise

fibration $Z \rightarrow Y$. This does not give the desired factorization; the structure maps for Z are wrong.

The following lemma appears in [17, Prop. 10.4], but the previous lemma makes the technical details of that proof clearer.

Lemma 3.5. *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper model category, then the strict weak equivalences of $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ are closed under composition.*

Proof. It suffices to assume that there is a cofinite directed level representation for the diagram

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xleftarrow{h} Z \xrightarrow{g} W$$

in which f and g are levelwise weak equivalences while h is a pro-isomorphism (but not a levelwise isomorphism). We must construct a levelwise weak equivalence isomorphic to the composition $gh^{-1}f$.

By Lemma 3.2, after reindexing we can factor $h : Z \rightarrow Y$ into a levelwise cofibration $Z \rightarrow A$ followed by a levelwise fibration $A \rightarrow Y$ such that

$$X \rightarrow Y \leftarrow A \leftarrow Z \rightarrow W$$

is a level representation in which the first and fourth maps are levelwise weak equivalences, and the second and third are pro-isomorphisms.

Let B be the pullback $X \times_Y A$, and let C be the pushout $A \amalg_Z W$. Since pushouts and pullbacks can be constructed levelwise, the maps $B \rightarrow A$ and $A \rightarrow C$ are levelwise weak equivalences. Here we use that the model structure is left and right proper. Moreover, the maps $B \rightarrow X$ and $W \rightarrow C$ are pro-isomorphisms since base and cobase changes preserve isomorphisms. Hence the composition $B \rightarrow C$ is the desired levelwise weak equivalence. $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper model category, and let f and g be two composable maps in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$. If g and gf are strict weak equivalences, then f is a strict weak equivalence. If f and gf are strict weak equivalences, then g is a strict weak equivalence.*

Proof. We first prove the first claim. We may consider a cofinite directed level representation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ W & \longrightarrow & Z \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are levelwise weak equivalences and the bottom horizontal map is a pro-isomorphism (but not a levelwise isomorphism). We want to show that the top horizontal map is an essentially levelwise weak equivalence.

By Lemma 3.2, after reindexing there exists a level representation

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & Z \end{array}$$

such that B is the levelwise pullback $A \times_Z Y$; the first and third vertical maps are levelwise weak equivalences; the map $W \rightarrow A$ is a levelwise *acyclic* cofibration and a

pro-isomorphism; and the map $A \rightarrow Z$ is a levelwise fibration and a pro-isomorphism. Because of right properness, the map $B \rightarrow A$ is also a levelwise weak equivalence. By the two-out-of-three axiom in $\mathcal{C}$, the induced map $X \rightarrow B$ is a levelwise weak equivalence.

On the other hand, the map $B \rightarrow Y$ is an isomorphism because base changes preserve isomorphisms. Hence $X \rightarrow B$ is isomorphic to f .

The proof of the second claim is similar. We start with a cofinite directed level representation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & W \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are levelwise weak equivalences and the top horizontal map is a pro-isomorphism. We want to show that the bottom horizontal map is an essentially levelwise weak equivalence. We produce a level representation

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & W \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & Z \end{array}$$

such that B is the levelwise pushout $A \amalg_X Y$; the first and third vertical maps are levelwise weak equivalences; the map $A \rightarrow W$ is a levelwise *acyclic* fibration and a pro-isomorphism; and the map $X \rightarrow A$ is a levelwise cofibration and a pro-isomorphism. The map $B \rightarrow Z$ is the desired level representation. $\square$

The above lemmas imply that our definition of strict weak equivalences agrees with the definition of [10, §3.3].

Proposition 3.7. *When $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper model category, the strict weak equivalences of Definition 3.1 agree with the weak equivalences of [10, §3.3].*

Proof. The weak equivalences of [10, §3.3] are by definition compositions of essentially levelwise weak equivalences. By Lemma 3.5, these compositions are again essentially levelwise weak equivalences. On the other hand, every levelwise weak equivalence can be factored into a levelwise acyclic cofibration followed by a levelwise acyclic fibration. Therefore, every levelwise weak equivalence is a weak equivalence in the sense of [10, §3.3]. $\square$

The preceding proposition is closely related to the main result of [22]. However, we make a useful observation missed there. Namely, it is not necessary to saturate the essentially levelwise weak equivalences; they are already saturated when $\mathcal{C}$ is proper.

4. STRICT MODEL STRUCTURES

Beginning with a proper model structure on a category $\mathcal{C}$, we now establish a model structure on the category $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 4.1. The **strict cofibrations** of $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ are the essentially levelwise cofibrations.

Definition 4.2. A map in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ is a **special fibration** if it has a cofinite directed level representation p for which every relative matching map $M_s p$ is a fibration. A map in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ is a **fibration** if it is a retract of a special fibration.

In order to help us understand these definitions, we need some auxiliary notions.

Definition 4.3. A map in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ is a **special acyclic fibration** if it has a cofinite directed level representation p for which every relative matching map $M_s p$ is an acyclic fibration.

Remark 4.4. Every special acyclic fibration is a special fibration, so it is also a strict fibration. We shall see below in Proposition 4.14 that the class of strict acyclic fibrations is equal to the class of retracts of special acyclic fibrations.

Lemma 4.5. *Special acyclic fibrations are essentially levelwise acyclic fibrations. In particular, they are strict acyclic fibrations.*

Proof. Special acyclic fibrations are special fibrations, so they are strict fibrations by definition. This means that the second statement follows from the first.

Suppose given a cofinite directed level representation $p : X \rightarrow Y$ for which each $M_s p$ is an acyclic fibration. The map $p_s : X_s \rightarrow Y_s$ factors as

$$X_s \xrightarrow{M_s p} Y_s \times_{\lim_{t < s} Y_t} \lim_{t < s} X_t \xrightarrow{q_s} Y_s.$$

Since compositions and base changes preserve acyclic fibrations, it suffices to show inductively in s that $\lim_{t < s} p_t : \lim_{t < s} X_t \rightarrow \lim_{t < s} Y_t$ is an acyclic fibration for every s . Using that $M_t p$ is an acyclic fibration for $t < s$, an induction in t shows that $\lim_{t < s} p_t$ is also an acyclic fibration. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *Strict fibrations are essentially levelwise fibrations.*

Proof. The proof of Lemma 4.5 shows that special fibrations are essentially levelwise fibrations. Retracts of special fibrations are also essentially levelwise fibrations by Proposition 2.2. $\square$

Lemma 4.7. *Every map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ factors as a strict cofibration $i : X \rightarrow Z$ followed by a special acyclic fibration $p : Z \rightarrow Y$.*

Proof. We may suppose that f is a level representation indexed by a cofinite directed set. Suppose for induction that the maps $i_t : X_t \rightarrow Z_t$ and $p_t : Z_t \rightarrow Y_t$ have already been defined for $t < s$. Consider the map

$$X_s \rightarrow Y_s \times_{\lim_{t < s} Y_t} \lim_{t < s} Z_t.$$

Factor it into a cofibration $i_s : X_s \rightarrow Z_s$ followed by an acyclic fibration

$$p_s : Z_s \rightarrow Y_s \times_{\lim_{t < s} Y_t} \lim_{t < s} Z_t.$$

This extends the factorization to level s . $\square$

Lemma 4.8. *Every map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ factors as an essentially levelwise acyclic cofibration $i : X \rightarrow Z$ followed by a special fibration $p : Z \rightarrow Y$.*

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Lemma 4.7, except that we factor the map

$$X_s \rightarrow Y_s \times_{\lim_{t < s} Y_t} \lim_{t < s} Z_t$$

into an acyclic cofibration followed by a fibration. $\square$

Remark 4.9. The previous lemma uses the class of essentially levelwise acyclic cofibrations. It does not follow immediately from the definitions that this class is equal to the class of strict acyclic cofibrations. If a map is isomorphic to a levelwise weak equivalence and to a levelwise cofibration, it may be necessary to use two different index categories to obtain the two level representations. In fact, the essentially levelwise acyclic cofibrations are the same as the strict acyclic cofibrations, as we shall show in Proposition 4.13.

Remark 4.10. The previous two lemmas do not give functorial factorizations. The problem is that the reindexing into cofinite directed level representations is not functorial. This is the reason that strict model structures do not have functorial factorizations.

Next we show that the classes of strict cofibrations and retracts of special acyclic fibrations determine each other by lifting properties. Similarly, the classes of essentially levelwise acyclic cofibrations and strict fibrations determine each other.

Lemma 4.11. *A map is a strict cofibration if and only if it has the left lifting property with respect to all retracts of special acyclic fibrations. Also, a map has the right lifting property with respect to all strict cofibrations if and only if it is a retract of a special acyclic fibration.*

Proof. Suppose given a square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & X \\ i \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\ B & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array}$$

in which i is a strict cofibration and p is a special acyclic fibration. By reindexing, we may assume that the diagram is a cofinite directed level representation such that each $i_s : A_s \rightarrow B_s$ is a cofibration and such that each map $M_s p$ is an acyclic fibration.

Assume that for all $t < s$, we have already constructed maps $B_{a(t)} \rightarrow X_t$ belonging to a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_{a(t)} & \longrightarrow & X_t \\ \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ B_{a(t)} & \longrightarrow & Y_t \times_{\lim_{u < t} Y_u} \lim_{u < t} X_u. \end{array}$$

Choose $a(s)$ to be greater than $a(t)$ for all $t < s$ and also greater than s ; this is possible because the indexing set is cofinite. Thus we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_{a(s)} & \longrightarrow & X_s \\ i_{a(t)} \downarrow & & \downarrow M_s p \\ B_{a(s)} & \longrightarrow & Y_s \times_{\lim_{t < s} Y_t} \lim_{t < s} X_s. \end{array}$$

A lift exists in this diagram since $i_{a(t)}$ is a cofibration and $M_s p$ is an acyclic fibration. By induction on s , we construct a lift $B \rightarrow X$.

We have shown that strict cofibrations lift with respect to special acyclic fibrations. Formally, it follows that strict cofibrations lift with respect to retracts of special acyclic fibrations.

Now suppose that a map $i : A \rightarrow B$ has the left lifting property with respect to all special acyclic fibrations. Use Lemma 4.7 to factor i as a strict cofibration $i' : A \rightarrow B'$ followed by a special acyclic fibration $p : B' \rightarrow B$. Then we have a square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{i'} & B' \\ i \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\ B & \xrightarrow{=} & B, \end{array}$$

and a lift exists in this square by assumption. Hence i is a retract of i' . But retracts preserve strict cofibrations by Proposition 2.2, so i is again a strict cofibration.

Finally, suppose that $p : X \rightarrow Y$ has the right lifting property with respect to all strict cofibrations. Use Lemma 4.7 to factor p as a strict cofibration $i : X \rightarrow X'$ followed by a special acyclic fibration $p' : X' \rightarrow Y$. Similarly to the previous paragraph, p is a retract of p' . $\square$

Lemma 4.12. *A map is an essentially levelwise acyclic cofibration if and only if it has the right lifting property with respect to all strict fibrations. Also, a map has the right lifting property with respect to all essentially levelwise acyclic cofibrations if and only if it is a strict fibration.*

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 4.11, except that the roles of cofibrations and acyclic fibrations are replaced by acyclic cofibrations and fibrations respectively. Lemma 4.8 is relevant instead of Lemma 4.7. $\square$

Proposition 4.13. *A map is a strict acyclic cofibration if and only if it is an essentially levelwise acyclic cofibration.*

Proof. One direction follows from the definitions.

Let $i : A \rightarrow B$ be a strict weak equivalence and strict cofibration. We may assume that i is a level representation that is a levelwise weak equivalence. Then we may use the argument of the proof of Lemma 4.7 to factor i as an essentially levelwise acyclic cofibration $i' : A \rightarrow B'$ followed by a special acyclic fibration $p : B' \rightarrow B$. Hence we have a square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{i'} & B' \\ i \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\ B & \xrightarrow{=} & B, \end{array}$$

and a lift exists in this square by Lemma 4.11 because i is a strict cofibration and p is a special acyclic fibration. Therefore, i is a retract of i' . But retracts preserve essentially levelwise acyclic cofibrations by Proposition 2.2, so i is also an essentially levelwise acyclic cofibration. $\square$

Proposition 4.14. *A map is a strict acyclic fibration if and only if it is a retract of a special acyclic fibration.*

Proof. A special acyclic fibration is a strict acyclic fibration by Lemma 4.5. For the other direction, let $p : X \rightarrow Y$ be a strict weak equivalence and strict fibration. We may assume that p is a level representation that is a levelwise weak equivalence. Then we may use the argument of the proof of Lemma 4.7 to factor p as an essentially levelwise acyclic cofibration $i : X \rightarrow X'$ followed by a special acyclic fibration $p' : X' \rightarrow Y$. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 4.13, p is a retract of p' . $\square$

Theorem 4.15. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a proper model category. Then the classes of strict weak equivalences, strict cofibrations, and strict fibrations define a proper model structure on $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Completeness and cocompleteness follows from [17, Prop. 11.1]. The two-out-of-three axiom is proved in Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6. The retract axiom for strict cofibrations and strict weak equivalences follows from Proposition 2.2, where it is shown that any class of essentially levelwise maps is always closed under retract. The retract axiom for strict fibrations is true by definition.

Using Propositions 4.13 and 4.14, the factorization axiom is given in Lemmas 4.7 and 4.8. Similarly, the lifting axiom follows from Lemmas 4.11 and 4.12.

This finishes the proofs of the basic model structure axioms. It remains to consider properness. We shall show that the strict model structure is right proper; the proof of left properness is dual.

Let $p : X \rightarrow Y$ be a strict fibration, and let $f : Z \rightarrow Y$ be a strict weak equivalence. By Lemma 4.6, we know that p is an essentially levelwise fibration.

We do not have a level representation

$$Z \xrightarrow{f} Y \xleftarrow{p} X$$

because we cannot necessarily represent f by a levelwise weak equivalence and p by a levelwise fibration with the same indexing category. Nevertheless, we do have a level representation

$$Z \xrightarrow{f} W \xrightarrow{g} Y \xleftarrow{p} X$$

in which p is a levelwise fibration, f is a levelwise weak equivalence, and g is a pro-isomorphism (but not necessarily a levelwise isomorphism). This gives us a level representation

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Z \times_Y X & \xrightarrow{f'} & W \times_Y X & \xrightarrow{g'} & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow p' & & \downarrow p \\ Z & \xrightarrow{f} & W & \xrightarrow{g} & Y, \end{array}$$

where the pullbacks are computed levelwise. Because g and therefore g' are isomorphisms, f' is a level representation for $Z \times_Y X \rightarrow X$. Hence it suffices to show that f' is a levelwise weak equivalence.

Since pullbacks preserve fibrations in $\mathcal{C}$, we know that p' is a levelwise fibration. Now the map f' is a levelwise pullback of a weak equivalence along a fibration, so it is a levelwise weak equivalence because $\mathcal{C}$ is right proper. $\square$

Remark 4.16. The proof of properness in [17, Prop. 17.1] is incorrect, but the techniques described in the above proof can be used to fix it.

4.1. Simplicial Model Structures. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a simplicial category, then $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ is again a simplicial category. For any two pro-objects X and Y , the **simplicial mapping space** $\text{Map}(X, Y)$ is defined to be $\lim_s \text{colim}_t \text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_t, Y_s)$.

Beware that the definitions of tensor and cotensor are straightforward for finite simplicial sets but are slightly subtle in general. If X is a pro-object and K is a finite simplicial set, then $X \otimes K$ is defined by tensoring levelwise. Similarly, X^K is defined by cotensoring levelwise.

For an arbitrary simplicial set K , write it as a colimit $\text{colim}_s K_s$, where each K_s is a finite simplicial set. Then define $X \otimes K$ to be $\text{colim}_s^{\text{pro}}(X \otimes K_s)$, where the colimit is computed in the category $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$. This is not the same as tensoring levelwise with K . Similarly, X^K is defined to be $\lim_s^{\text{pro}}(X^{K_s})$, where the limit is computed in the category $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$. Again, this is not the same as cotensoring levelwise with K .

Theorem 4.17. *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper simplicial model category, then the strict structure on $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ is also simplicial.*

Proof. Most of the axioms are obvious or follow formally from the simplicial structure on $\mathcal{C}$. See [17, §16] for more details. We shall show that if $i : K \rightarrow L$ is a cofibration of finite simplicial sets and $j : A \rightarrow B$ is a strict cofibration in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$, then

$$A \otimes L \amalg_{A \otimes K} B \otimes K \rightarrow B \otimes L$$

is a strict cofibration, and it is acyclic if either i or j is. By adjointness [14, Lem. 10.3.6], this is equivalent to the usual SM7 axiom for simplicial model categories.

We may assume that i is a levelwise cofibration. If i is also acyclic, then we may assume by Proposition 4.13 that i is a levelwise acyclic cofibration. Because $\mathcal{C}$ is a simplicial model category, the map

$$A_s \otimes L \amalg_{A_s \otimes K} B_s \otimes K \rightarrow B_s \otimes L$$

is a cofibration, and it is acyclic if either i_s or j is acyclic. Because K and L are finite, this shows that

$$A \otimes L \amalg_{A \otimes K} B \otimes K \rightarrow B \otimes L$$

is a levelwise cofibration and that it is a levelwise acyclic cofibration if either i or j is acyclic. $\square$

5. NON-FIBRANTLY GENERATED MODEL CATEGORIES

In [17, Cor. 19.3], it was shown that strict model structures are not always cofibrantly generated [14, Defn. 13.2.2], even if $\mathcal{C}$ is cofibrantly generated. For example, the strict model structure for pro-simplicial sets is not cofibrantly generated. In this section, we study whether strict model structures are fibrantly generated.

Let λ be any ordinal. Then λ is the partially ordered set of all ordinals strictly less than λ . A **λ -tower** Z in a category is a contravariant functor from λ such that for all limit ordinals β , the object Z_β is isomorphic to $\lim_{\alpha < \beta} Z_\alpha$. In other words, it is a diagram

$$\cdots \rightarrow Z_\beta \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow Z_1 \rightarrow Z_0$$

of length λ . Note that Z_β is defined only for $\beta < \lambda$, not for $\beta = \lambda$. This definition is dual to the notion of λ -sequence that arises in discussions of the small object argument [14, Defn. 12.2.1].

Definition 5.1. Let C be a class of maps in a category. A map $p : X \rightarrow Y$ is a **C -cocell complex** if there exists a λ -tower Z such that each map $Z_{\beta+1} \rightarrow Z_\beta$ is a base change of a map belonging to C and such that the projection $\lim_{\beta < \lambda} Z_\beta \rightarrow Z_0$ is isomorphic to the map p .

This definition is dual to the usual notion of cell complex [14, Defn. 12.4.7].

Proposition 5.2. Let C be any class of maps in a category $\mathcal{C}$, and let cC be the image in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ of the class C under the constant functor. If f is a cofinite directed level representation such that each map $M_s f$ belongs to C , then f is a cC -cocell complex.

Proof. Let f be a cofinite directed level representation indexed by a cofinite directed set I such that each $M_s f$ belongs to C . Choose a well-ordering ϕ of I that respects the ordering on I ; thus ϕ is a set isomorphism from I to some ordinal λ such that $\phi(s) \geq \phi(t)$ whenever $s \geq t$.

We define a λ -tower Z as follows. Set Z_0 equal to Y . For every successor ordinal $\beta + 1$, let s be the unique element of I such that $\phi(s) = \beta$. Define $Z_{\beta+1}$ by the pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z_{\beta+1} & \longrightarrow & Z_\beta \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ cX_s & \longrightarrow & cY_s \times_{\lim_{t < s}^{\text{pro}} cY_t} \lim_{t < s}^{\text{pro}} cX_t. \end{array}$$

Note that the bottom horizontal map is equal to $cM_s f$ because c commutes with finite limits. Also note that by transfinite induction, each Z_β comes equipped with a map

$$Z_\beta \rightarrow cY_s \times_{\lim_{t < s}^{\text{pro}} cY_t} \lim_{t < s}^{\text{pro}} cX_t.$$

For limit ordinals β , define Z_β to be $\lim_{\alpha < \beta}^{\text{pro}} Z_\alpha$. Thus we have constructed a cC -cocell complex Z . A consideration of universal properties shows that $\lim_{\beta < \lambda}^{\text{pro}} Z_\beta$ is isomorphic to X ; here we use that X is isomorphic to $\lim_s^{\text{pro}} cX_s$. Also, the projection $\lim_{\beta < \lambda}^{\text{pro}} Z_\beta \rightarrow Z_0$ is equal to f . $\square$

Proposition 5.3. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a proper model category, and let I and J be the classes of fibrations and acyclic fibrations in $\mathcal{C}$ respectively. The class of strict fibrations is equal to the class of retracts of cI -cocell complexes, and the class of strict acyclic fibrations is equal to the class of retracts of cJ -cocell complexes.

Proof. We prove only the first statement; the proof of the second uses Proposition 4.14 but is otherwise identical.

One implication follows immediately from Proposition 5.2. For the other direction, first observe that maps in cI are special fibrations. Base changes and compositions along λ -towers preserve right lifting properties, so all cI -cocell complexes are strict fibrations. Finally, retracts preserve lifting properties, so retracts of cI -cocell complexes are strict fibrations. $\square$

Remark 5.4. One direction of the previous proof uses the lifting property characterization of strict fibrations, which we know because of Theorem 4.15, but the other direction does not. It seems plausible that for any category $\mathcal{C}$ and any class C of maps, a map in $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ should be a retract of a cC -cocell complex if and only if it is a retract of a map that has a cofinite directed level representation for which all the relative matching maps belong to C . However, we have not been able to prove this claim in such generality.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a proper model category, and let I and J be the classes of fibrations and acyclic fibrations in $\mathcal{C}$ respectively. The class of strict cofibrations is determined by the left lifting property with respect to cJ , and the class of strict acyclic cofibrations is determined by the left lifting property with respect to cI .*

Proof. We only prove the first claim; the proof of the second is identical.

It is straightforward to check that every strict cofibration has the left lifting property with respect to every element of cJ . Conversely, if a map i has the left lifting property with respect to every element of cJ , then i has the left lifting property with respect to retracts of cJ -cocell complexes. By Proposition 5.3, i lifts with respect to all strict acyclic fibrations, so it is a strict cofibration. $\square$

Every object of every pro-category is cosmall [5]. Therefore, Proposition 5.5 almost shows that the strict model structure on $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$ is fibrantly generated. The problem is that the collections cI and cJ of generating strict fibrations and generating strict acyclic fibrations are *not* sets.

Proposition 5.6. *The strict structure on pro-simplicial sets is not fibrantly generated.*

Proof. Suppose that the strict structure on pro-simplicial sets is fibrantly generated. Let I be a set of generating strict fibrations. By the dual to the usual small object argument, every strict fibration is a retract of an I -cocell complex.

Now let $\lim I$ be the image of I under the limit functor. Since the constant functor c and the limit functor form a Quillen pair between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\text{pro-}\mathcal{C}$, every element of $\lim I$ is a fibration of simplicial sets.

Every fibration of simplicial sets is the image of a strict fibration under the limit functor, so every fibration is a retract of a $(\lim I)$ -cocell complex. This means that the set $\lim I$ of fibrations detects acyclic cofibrations of simplicial sets. No such set exists, so we have obtained a contradiction. $\square$

Remark 5.7. The fact that no set of fibrations detects acyclic cofibrations of simplicial sets seems obvious, but the proof is not elementary. Bill Dwyer has shown us a proof, but it is too lengthy to reproduce here.

We describe one way to obtain a fibrantly generated model structure for pro-simplicial sets. Choose an uncountable cardinal κ . We say that a simplicial set is κ -bounded if it has fewer than κ simplices.

The category of κ -bounded simplicial sets equipped with the usual notions of weak equivalence, cofibration, and fibration is almost a model category but not quite. The problem is that not all small limits and colimits exist. Only the factorization axiom has a non-obvious proof. One must check that the usual small object argument factorizations produce κ -bounded simplicial sets.

Now the category of κ -bounded simplicial sets is small and has all finite limits. This means that the category $\text{pro-}(\kappa\text{-bounded simplicial sets})$ has all small limits and colimits [2, App. 4.3 and App. 4.4]. We obtain a strict model structure for $\text{pro-}(\kappa\text{-bounded simplicial sets})$, and it is fibrantly generated. As shown in Proposition 5.5, the constant fibrations of κ -bounded simplicial sets form a set of generating fibrations, and the constant acyclic fibrations of κ -bounded simplicial sets form a set of generating acyclic fibrations.

Therefore, the strict model structure on $\text{pro-}(\kappa\text{-bounded simplicial sets})$ is fibrantly generated. In some applications of pro-simplicial sets, it suffices to choose a κ larger than any of the simplicial sets occurring in the application. Thus, it is possible sometimes to use a fibrantly generated model structure to study the homotopy theory of pro-simplicial sets.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Artin, A. Grothendieck, and J. L. Verdier, *Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 269, Springer Verlag, 1972.
- [2] M. Artin and B. Mazur, *Etale homotopy*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 100, Springer Verlag, 1969.
- [3] A. K. Bousfield and E. M. Friedlander, *Homotopy theory of Γ -spaces, spectra, and bisimplicial sets*, Geometric Applications of Homotopy Theory, vol. II (Proc. Conf., Evanston, IL, 1977), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 658, Springer Verlag, 1978, pp. 80–130.
- [4] A. K. Bousfield and D. Kan, *Homotopy limits, completions, and localizations*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 304, Springer Verlag, 1972.
- [5] J. D. Christensen and D. C. Isaksen, *Duality and Pro-Spectra*, in preparation.
- [6] R. L. Cohen, J. D. S. Jones, and G. B. Segal, *Floer's infinite-dimensional Morse theory and homotopy theory*, The Floer memorial volume, Progr. Math., vol. 133, Birkhäuser, 1995, pp. 297–325.
- [7] J.-M. Cordier and T. Porter, *Shape theory: Categorical methods of approximation*, Ellis Horwood Series: Mathematics and Its Applications, 1989.
- [8] J. Duskin, *Pro-objects (after Verdier)*, Dualité de Poincaré (Seminaire Heidelberg-Strasbourg 1966/67), IRMA Strasbourg **3** (1969), Exposé 6.
- [9] W. G. Dwyer and J. Spaliński, *Homotopy theories and model categories*, Handbook of algebraic topology, North-Holland, 1995, pp. 73–126.
- [10] D. A. Edwards and H. M. Hastings, *Cech and Steenrod homotopy theories with applications to geometric topology*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 542, Springer Verlag, 1976.
- [11] A. D. Elmendorf, I. Kriz, M. A. Mandell, and J. P. May, *Rings, modules, and algebras in stable homotopy theory*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 47, American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- [12] J. Grossman, *A homotopy theory of pro-spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **201** (1975), 161–176.
- [13] H. M. Hastings, *Addendum to: Cech and Steenrod homotopy theories with applications to geometric topology*, Colloq. Math. **41** (1979), no. 1, 161–163.
- [14] P. Hirschhorn, *Localization of Model Categories*, preprint dated 4/12/2000.
- [15] Mark Hovey, *Model categories*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 63, American Mathematical Society, 1999.
- [16] M. Hovey, B. Shipley, and J. Smith, *Symmetric spectra*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (2000), no. 1, 149–208.
- [17] D. C. Isaksen, *A model structure on the category of pro-simplicial sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), no. 7, 2805–2841.
- [18] D. C. Isaksen, *Calculating limits and colimits in pro-categories*, preprint.
- [19] D. C. Isaksen, *Completions of pro-spaces*, in preparation.
- [20] S. Mardešić and J. Segal, *Shape theory: The inverse system approach*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 26, North-Holland, 1982.
- [21] C. V. Meyer, *Approximation filtrante de diagrammes finis par Pro-C*, Ann. Math. Sci. Québec **4** (1980), no. 1, 35–57.
- [22] T. Porter, *On the two definitions of $\text{Ho}(\text{proC})$* , Topology Appl. **28** (1988), no. 3, 289–293.

- [23] D. G. Quillen, *Homotopical algebra*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 43, Springer Verlag, 1967.
- [24] D. Sullivan, *Genetics of homotopy theory and the Adams conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2) **100** (1974), 1–79.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, NOTRE DAME, IN 46556
E-mail address: `isaksen.1@nd.edu`